

MAR 27 2007

## REMARKS

The Examiner restricted the prosecution of the above-identified application to one of the following groups:

- Group I Claims 1-28, drawn to methods of removing dye from polyester,
- Group II Claims 29-39, drawn to dye removal compositions,
- Group III Claims 40-50, drawn to dye removal devices, and
- Group IV Claims 51-55, drawn to methods for recycling panel fabric.

Applicant elects to prosecute the claims of Group I in this application with traverse. Claims 29-55 have been withdrawn.

The Examiner has stated that Inventions I and III or IV are related as process and apparatus for practice. However, Invention IV includes process claims. Clarification is requested.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the restriction requirement is erroneous and should be withdrawn. There are two criteria for a proper requirement for restriction between patentably distinct inventions: (1) the inventions must be independent or distinct as claimed; and (2) there must be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is required. MPEP § 803.

According to MPEP § 803, the Examiner must examine an entire application on the merits, including claims to distinct or independent inventions, so long as the search and examination of the entire applications can be made without serious burden. With respect to the restriction, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to establish any undue burden placed upon the PTO by the presence of all of the

-10-

US2000 0470941 1

claims in the same application. A search of one invention would likely produce art related to the other inventions. Applicants respectfully submit that examination of the claims of the entire application will not impose an undue burden.

Respectfully submitted,

Camilla C. Williams

Camilla C. Williams  
Reg. No. 43,992

OF COUNSEL:  
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP  
1100 Peachtree Street  
Suite 2800  
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530  
Phone: 404.815.6188  
Fax: 404-815-6555

Attorney Docket No. IRC 301 I4060/260859